G. R. S. IX-5]

Previous references.

74 of 35

1923. 74

(Mun)

File No. 32

Serial Nos 1 — x

x c 962 x x 9

The taking of

Later references.

Drug 153-23-1-5

365-27-1-2

2-24, 31+32

19-26 6-11

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 1 — 76

Part B for Internal Affairs

SUBJECT.

Question re Haja Hussain Haja of Belgaum Succession etc.

C. 1 A" 1923 Jour 32 15 M.

Q 17 15. 21 - Succession Certificate in respect of Securities Un Income Tax Act

WD 1888—GPB—16,826—25-7-21

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(Murrai)

NOTES.

File No. 32-13

FILE HEADING.

Affairs of the Dy. Hussaini Darga at Balepet. Bangalore City

From

No.	Dated	Received

Diary No. 177	Enclos.	Spare Copies.	Serial No.

BRIEF ABSTRACT OF LETTER.

NOTES AND ORDERS.

NOTES—First Sheet.

GPB—35,000—15 6-12

G.H.S. 13.]

177

(2

Routine Notes. A 32-13.

[To be used only for notes, requisitions, etc., not intended for permanent record]

Dewan's Order.

D/177/13-14. The petition may be sent to the Deputy Commissioner who may be asked to report why the appeal has been pending so long and when it may be expected to be decided.

Sd 1.

Intd. H. V.

17. 7. 1913.

To B VII

28
20/7

2 Draft. Ltr 1167

2 A/

Dft. Submtd

AD (132)
24.7.13

Ltr abd 1167

2 To The Dy. Comm. Bangalore

No. 277 D/29.7.13

Forwards the above petn. and calls for a report as to why the appeal has been pending so long.

No. 278. Intimates the petr. Syed Essack of the above

3

N. B.—Should routine notes be written on small slips, the notes must be copied, or slips pasted on this form.

GPB—25,000—26-7-12

C3

G.R.S. 13]

2n 732-13

Routine Notes.

[To be used only for notes, requisitions, etc., not intended for permanent record.]

Secretary's order on the petition from Syed Issack, Hukdar Muzzavar of the Balepet Darga, Bangalore, (sent to the Muzrai Branch for needful action on 21.7.1913).

.....

" Has report been received from the Deputy Commissioner? If not, send reminder."

Intd. K.R.S.
12.9.1913.

To,

The Superintendent,
Muzrai Branch.

VS.
13-9-13

File Subd. Draft Memo is
Bad. Subd for approval
13.9.13 SL
15/9/13

Keep this in mind and
send fortnightly reminders
hereafter
15/9/14

N. B — Should routine notes be written on small slips, the notes must be copied or slips pasted on this form

GPB—25,000—23-7-12

G. R. S. 12]

General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 32 4 13 of 1914.

Serial No.	
4	From, the Dy Commr, Bangalore 25th Letter no 933 dd 9.6.1914 Submits an ad. interim report. The Dy Commr wants time to Consider the claims of the parties urging for the post, and submit a report. The receipt of the further report may be awaited Submitted M 11/8 10/7/1914 RL 11.7.14 11.7.14 Rec
	The records connected with the case have not been received. A Dft letter calling for the records, is submitted for approval &c. Submitted M 17/7/14 RL 17/7/14
6.	From, Syed Sha Ali, Muzavar of the Darga, - Petition dd 22-7-14.

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPB—60,000—7.11.13.

G. R. S. 111-2]

General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 32 of 1913

Serial No.

Appeals against the Dy Commrs order holding that the respt Syed Isak. is entitled to the office of the Muzavar of Raja Hussein Darga at Balepet, Bangalore, and prays for an additional order directing Stay of the execution of the Dy. Commrs. order appealed against pending disposal of his appeal by Govt.

The petition is duly Stamped. A copy of the order appealed against has been produced - the Dy. Commrs. order is dated 3-7-19 while the appeal was presented on 22-7-19. It is within time.

The grounds for appeal are summarized in the petition. The apltt says that he has been the Muzavar for the past 30 years (he has been the Muzavar since 1904-05) and prays that pending orders of Govt on his appeal, the Dy. Commrs. order appeal may not be given effect to

Submitted 8/9 18

M 13/9/19

11.9.19

recd 13/9/19

NOTE—Contn. sheet

WD A 1

G. R. S. III-2]

(6.

General and Revenue Secretariat.

Mer File No. 32 of 1913.

Serial No.

1286
21.10.19

The appeal may be admitted and the records called for. There seems to be no need to issue any 'stay' order.

20.10.19

3rd December 20

21 I agree

25/10/19

A.C.

25.10.19 24 23.10.19

24 1-11-19

7. D. by. Commn. Bangalore No. 1489 dy. 13.11.19.

Forwards the appel. petn. & calls for a detailed report thereon with the entire records of the Case

8 1490 informs petnr of the above & states that Final orders cannot be passed (copy)

Note—Conts. sheet.

G. R. S. III-2]

General and Revenue Secretariat.

Inward File No. 32 of 19 VB

Serial No. 9.

From, The Dy Comr, Bangalore Dt.
Letter No. 459 Dt 16-6-1920
Submits report with record
called for on the subject.

(G. R. S. III-2)

General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 382 of 1918.

Serial No.

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

G. R. S. III-2.

General and Revenue Secretariat

File No. 32 of 19 13

Serial No

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

3/7/20

G. R. S. III-2,

General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 22 of 1913

Serial No	
	Put up a draft U/10/7/20 Amt 10-7-20 U/S. Forbes Amt 12/7/20 Secretary Secretary U/17/7/20
438-93 20-7-20	Draft approved Sd 21-7-20 Issue U/21/7/20 Amt 21-7-20
10	D. C. Bangalore No. 301 dy. 27-7-20. Requests to hold enquiry into the claims of the petnr (by Sgt Lakshmipathi on 24-9-1919) [illegible]
11.	Comm, Mr Dy. Comnr., Bangalore Dist., Letter no. 459 dy 5-4-1921. Submits further report called in 82.4.

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

11

G. R. S. III-2.

General and Revenue Secretariat. File No. 32 of 1913

Serial No

The Dy. comrs. report explains the facts of the case.

There are 3 claimants to the muzawarship in question: —

(1) Syed Issac (2) Syed Sha Ali and (3) Syed Khutbuddin —

The Dy. comr. reports that from further evidence recorded, their relationship to the last holder — Syed Khasim is as noted below: —

Syed Issac — his father was a cousin brother (not uterine brother) of Syed Khasim, last male holder

Syed Sha Ali — is the husband, of Syed Khasim's younger daughter who died without issues.

Syed Khutbuddin — is the son of Raboobi, eldest daughter of the last male holder Syed Khasim.

The Dy. comr. is of opinion that out of the 3 claimants, Syed Khutbuddin is the nearest heir to the last office holder Syed Khasim.

Submitted for orders

The Syed Khutbuddin is the nearest heir to the last holder, his claim to the Muzawarship of the Dargah may be recognised. May the recom. of the Dy. Comr. be sanctd?

14.6.14

14.6.14

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

G. R. S. III-2]

General and Revenue Secretariat

File No. 32 of 1913

Serial No.

On 3rd July 1919, the Dr. decided that Syed Izaki was entitled to the office, which was disputed then by Syed Shah Ali -.

Two months after the decision as above, Syed Kutbuddin petd the Dr. urging his claim -

The Dr. now reports that Kutbuddin is the reason heir of the last holder & therefore entitled to the office -

Then the order of 3rd July 19 has to be cancelled - .

19-4-21

Is the office hereditary?
20/4/21

The appointment is hereditary (vide para 6 of G.O. No. 2528 Dy 28.11.1907).
Submitted
20.4.1921.
The use of the word hereditary in the order refd to above

NOTE—Contn. sheet

G.

General and Revenue Secretariat.

13

Serial No.

File No. 32 of 1913

Must seem to mean that the Office is hereditary.

RG
20/4/21

to does not decide the question
Put up

13 Bombay
38 ~~Calcutta~~ Madras
and 43 Calcutta
as per p. 143 (quoted) of Mulla.

WJ 21/4/21

When did the Vacancy occur? Who has been performing the duties of the office since 1904-5 and in what capacity? (Vide D.'s letter no 873 dated 8-1-1909 shows that Shaikh has been doing duty from 1904-5 to 1909.)

WJ 23/4/21

3 Law Books submitted
M 22/4/21

AJ 23/4/21

H1

The vacancy occurred in 1901.
In ~~the~~ Sheradan's Report dy 7-7-03.

NOTE—Contn. sheet

G R S III-2]

General and Revenue Secretariat.

14

File No. 72 of 19 13

Serial No

it is reported that Rahimaan Bi who was getting services performed, and from whom, Syed Sha Ali claims title as her son in-law, died some 2 years ago. Information will if necessary, be called for from the Dy. Commr.

Syed Sha Ali has been performing duties, under S.O. dt 28-11-07

In his order appealed against, the Dy. Commr states as follows:—

"The history of the case shows that apet (Syed Sha Ali) hereto enjoyed the office in his own right by any undisputed title for 30 years, as he claims. He only acted for his mother-in-law, at times at most, therefore Abdul Khader did not assert his rights."

Submitted

25.6.21

In what right was Syed Sha Ali doing duty? Is there any order appointing him

NOTE—Contn. sheet

Serial No

As Jamadar? 30/5/21

It is seen from the records that on the death of the previous Karkun Vicharaname Kartar Abdul Khaleq in 1898, one Haji Mahomed Sabi was conducting services in the Dargah with the aid of public subscriptions, and Syed Sha Ali was assisting the latter in his work.

No order appointing Syed Sha Ali as Jamadar is available.

If directed, the Dy. Commr. will be written to on the subject.

Submitted

[illegible] 8/6
4.6.1921. 1/6/21

Yes. Now Dy. C. may be asked to report why he has been doing duties during the last 25 years and on what right. Orders of appointments may be forwarded. 14/7/21

Reply received

[illegible] 8/6
4.7.21. 14.7.21

14/7/21

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

G. R. S. III-21

General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 32 of 19/3

Serial No.	
12	TB, D.C. Bangalore No. 288 dy. 18.7.21 Enquiries Who has been doing the duties during the last 25 years from whom right ?
13.	Diwan, the Dy. Comr., Bangalore Dist., Letter no. 459 dy 25.7.21. Reports that no order of appointment was produced by any of the 3 claimants, that during the life-time of Rahimun Bi, her son-in-law Syed Ibra Bi was looking after Muzavar Duties on her behalf, and continued to be in office even after her death in 1903, and adds that licenses issued for conducting "Urs" are in his name. Enquiries from writers The question for order is 26.7.21 the appt of Syed Kalandar to the Muzavarship of the Haja Hussain Dargah at Balapet which has been recommended by the Dy Comr as he is said to be the nearest heir to the last holder. BA 27.7.21

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

G. R. S. III-2]

General and Revenue Secretariat. File No. of 19

Serial No

This appeal relates to the office of Mujawar at the Raja Hussain Dargah at Bakapet, Bangalore City.

The following genealogical tree shows the relationship between the rival claimants to the office:—

Syed Kasim (deceased) 1
Rahuman Bi (deceased) 2

3 Syed Abdul Khadir — Cousin

Rahimbi 4

5 Sykabi (deceased)
Syed Shafi 7
ali
no issue

6

8 Kutbudin

The last male holder of the office was Syed Kasim (1) who died about 25 years ago. After his death, his son-in-law Syed Shafi ali (7) was looking after the duties on behalf of his wife

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

(G R S. III-2)

General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. [illegible] of 19

General No

Rahimuja Bi ... deed in 13
and held the offi... has
discharge the duties of the office
since) [illegible] he has been
appointed permanently to the said office
up the place [illegible] of
Syed Esak (?) who is the son
of a cousin of Syed Khasim (1)
and Syed [illegible] (?) claims
the office and the Commissioner decided
Ground that he was a [illegible]
Member of the family while the
Father's claim was based on
on his marriage with the daughter
of (1). Kuppuchia (?) did not
prefer any claim until the
[illegible] presented a petition to
Govt. which was granted by
Govt. The new heir is
[illegible] nearer heir of [illegible] male
of the office, [illegible] his daughter

Dec 3.7.1914

F 24.9.1914

P.N.D

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

Serial No

Virkam

By

Say, that Syed Isac who is
on a Congress Can and he
recommends that his office may
be given to Rutherford
ali has been discharging the duties
of the office for several years past
does not appear any objection on
thereto as can be seen from the
following two authorities :—
(1) a stranger possession of the office
adverse to the family of the Khans
till he is appointed as permanent
G. 8693-L.R. 298-12-6 dated
7 May 1914. (2) that ali has
not been appointed permanent yet
limitation where a person is not
appointed at all to the office in his
own right, but is doing the work
on behalf (i.e as Gumasta) of a
Nakshan and is therefore bound to
vacate it when the proper Nakshan
was forthcoming to be appointed
for the place — (G. 4061 L.R.

C

NOTE—Contn. sheet

G. R. S. III-2]

l Revenue
ariat.

File No. 7,2 of 19 13

15

Serial No.

481-17-6 dated 22 September 1919.

A { May be appointed to the post. Caretaker with Manager is the officiates at Talikas. Vide Rule 218. Rules Manual) First Member 3/8/21

885-18-2
5.8.21

B A. approves. I presume that he is otherwise also fit & competent to be appointed to the post. It is strange that he did not press his claim earlier. Presumably he is a young man, who did not want to oust his Uncle (aunt's husband) from the place he has occupied for several years. Do not appoint before it.

Rules
6.8.21

C Make enquiries & (illegible) information 7/11/8/21

D Office Submit 11.8.21. 12/8/21 Done at once 7/13/8/21

NOTE.—Contn. sheet.

G. R. S. III-2,

General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 32 of 19/3

Serial No	
14	To D.C. Bangalore No. 712—W/13.8.21 Syed Engineer's letter, Kutbudin in question is quite fit & competent for the post, how old he is, where he is & what he is at present etc
15	From, the Dy Comr. Bangalore Dist., Letter no. 459 D/19.9.21. Reports that Syed Kutbudin - now 24 years old - is residing in Malle Nagara, Bangalore and is now without any work, and that he is fit and competent for the post. Submits for orders. The Member in C. has been pleased to approve of the appt of Kutbudin as Mukhtyar (vide para 836 Cpa) & has also been ascertained that he is otherwise fit & competent & appl a draft order thereon this appl. will be put up. + BB 20/9/21

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

G. R. S. III-2

General and Revenue Secretariat.

Revenue File No. 32 of 1923

Serial No.

2132-251.
30-9-24.

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

2 Nos

G.R.S. 29A]

19 .

From

Secy. to the Govt. of His Highness
The Maharaja of Mysore,
Genl. and Rev. Dept.

To

The D.C Bangalore Dist.

Dated 29th July 1913

Despatched

Received

General No. 277

Genl. No. 32-13-2

Enclosure No. 1.

Has the honor to forward herewith petition regd. no. 177 Dy 17th July 1913 from Syed Essack, Hakdar Munzanar of the Raja Hussaini Darga, Balepet, Bangalore city, Complaining that the appeal ~~to~~ filed by the counter-petr. Syed Sha Ali before the Dy. Commr., Bangalore, is pending for a number of years past, And to request that a report may be submitted as to why the appeal has been pending

G.P.B.—20,000—24.10.10.

So long, and when it may be expected to be decided.

(Dewan's order)
DFB

B O.
24/7/13
for Secretary
RG
24-7-13

Encl

2457

No 278 Dt 29 7-913
Mun 32-13-3
32-13-3

In reply to his letter regd. no. 177 Dt 17th July 1913 complaining that the appeal filed by Syed Shahi about the Raja Hussain Dargah at Balepet, Bangalore city, before the Bangalore Dy. Commr ~~has~~ been pending for a no of years past etc., Syed Essack, Hakdar Mutzavar residing in Old Police Lines, C.T.Dn Station of the said Dargah is informed that the Dy. Commr, Bangalore Dist, ~~has called for the matter~~ a report has been called for from the ~~report why the appeal has been pending so long and when it may be expected to be decided~~

By order,
Secretary.
24.7.13

24.7.13

32-13

G.R.S. 29A]

R/ 1903-14

From

Secy. to the Govt. of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore, Genl. and Rev. Dept.

To The Dy Com^r Bangalore.

Dated
Despatched 19-7-1913.
Received

General No. 727
No. 32-13
Enclosure No. —

This Price docket No. 277 M 732-13-2
Dated the 29th July 1913
forwarding Rep from Syed Sasack, Hukdar Muzavan of the Raja Hossein Dargah, Balepet, Bangalore city complaining that the appeal filed by the complainant Syed Shah ali before the Dy Com^r Bangalore District has been pending for a long time &c

Has the Honble Minister any remarks to offer on the above &c

MGCPB—20,000—16-2-05



DIARY No. 2331



32-13
4

From The Deputy Commissioner
Bangalore District

To The Secretary to the Govt
Genl & Rev. Depts.

Dated Bangalore

Despatched

Received 9. 6. 14.

General No. S 933
No.

Enclosure No.

Re Muzavarship of the Raja Hussein Dargah at Balepet — Stating that the matter will be finally disposed of on receipt of the enquiry of the Amildar, Bangalore Taluk.

S. 933.

Office of the Deputy Commissioner
Bangalore District
Dated Bangalore 5th June 1914,

From

R. Chandy Esqr. B.A.,
Deputy Commissioner,
Bangalore District.

To

D. K. Narasinga Rao Esqr. B.A. B.L.,
Officiating Secretary to Government of
Mysore,
General and Revenue Departments
Mysore, Bangalore.

Sir

With reference to your docket no. 277.
Mysy: 32-13-2.

dated the 29th July 1913 forwarding for report the petition of Syed Essock of Raja Hussein Dargah at Balepet Bangalore City praying for early disposal of the appeal preferred by the Counter-petitioner Syed Shah, regarding the Muzavarships of the Dargah,

I have the honor to state that the parties and their advocates were heard but before giving the decision, one Khutbuddin appeared before me and submitted a petition that he, being the daughters Son of the late Sanyavaree was the proper claimant for the Sanyavara Shep and prayed that his claims might be considered. To settle the matter once for all, the case was remanded for further enquiry by the Amildar after notice to this Claimant. The Amildar has been instructed to complete the enquiry and to submit his report within a month. After his report is received in this office the matter will be finally disposed of.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedient Servant
[illegible]
for Assistant Commissioner
Deputy Commissioner
Bangalore District
Absent from Station

115

1919 20
Meer
3
≤5

1233.

WD 1541—GPB—50,000—29 3 19—B.

191

From
The Deputy Commissioner
Bangalore Dt

To
The Joint Secretary
to Government
Army Dept

Dated 10th July 1919

Despatched 11—

Received

General No R dis 2288 07 08.19
No.

Enclosure No. One order

Re the ~~[illegible]~~ of
~~the lands [illegible]~~
~~Sy Rangamathaswamy~~
~~temple [illegible]~~
~~Salak~~ Inamdar
of Raja Hussain Dar
at Balapet, Bangalore

Office of the Deputy Commissioner

R Dis 228 of 1919 Bangalore District

Final order

Dated Bangalore 10th July 1919

From,

M. A. Narayana Iyengar Esqr. B.A.B.L.

Deputy Commissioner

Bangalore District.

To,

G. Aravamudu Iyengar Esqr. B.A.B.L

Joint Secretary to Government

Muzrai Department

Bangalore.

Sir,

Adverting to para 7 of Government Order no: 2528 of 28th November 1907 and your C.M. no: 277 Muz: 32-13-2 of 29th July 1913, calling for a report, in respect of the Muzaneriship of Raja Hussain Baiga at Balepet, Bangalore City, I have the honor to state as follows: —

The

The Amildar of Bangalore Taluk conducted an enquiry in the first instance, in the year 1909, and decided in favor of Syed Isack

2. Thereupon, Sha Ali to whom the produce of the Inam lands attached to this institution were ordered to be given in Government order no: 908-9 Mag: 74-05 of 29th January 1909, preferred an appeal to this office against the decision of the Amildar.

After hearing the appellant and the Respondent, who appeared with their advocates Mr. L. Shama Rao and Mr: M. Krishnamurti, on 3rd July 1919, I dismissed the appeal.

3. A copy of the order passed

Sd/

by me is herewith submitted for
the information of the Government

I have the honor to be

Sir,

your most obedient Servant

I Narayana Rao

for Deputy Commissioner

OR Bangalore District.

In the Court of the Deputy Commissioner,

Bangalore District.

Before:-- M. A. Narayana Iyengar, Esq., B.A., B.L.,

Deputy Commissioner, Bangalore District,

Bangalore.

Muzrai Appeal No. 3 of 18-19.

APPELLANT:- Respondent:

Syed Shali VS. Syed Issack

Appeal against the order of the Amildar of Bangalore Taluk directing that the Appellant is not a Hakdar but that the respondent is entitled to hold the Muzavarship of Raja Hussain Darga at Bangalore.

O R D E R.

The only point at issue is as to who is entitled to the Office of Muzavar of the Raja Hussain Darga as between appellant and respondent.

2. The last holders of the office were Syed Kasim and his brother Syed Abdul Khader. After Syed Kasim's death, his widow Rahimanbi appears to have been treated as the joint - Hakdar along with Syed Abdul Khader.

3. But in 1896 when Rahimanbi sued a tenant of the Darga properties for rent in the Munsiff's Court, her suit was dismissed on the ground that her title to the management was not established and Syed Abdul Khader who defended the suit as 2nd defendant admitted having collected the rent as the Muzavar.

4. In 1906, Sythabi, daughter of Rahimanbi and husband of appellant applied to the Deputy Commissioner to oust the respondent from the Office. Her application was rejected, one of the grounds for rejection being her reliance on an alleged sunnad of Tippu Sultan of 1804 which could not possibly be genuine.

5. Both Rahimanbi and Sythabi are now dead, and appellant claims the office by (1) an alleged long enjoyment for over 30 years, and (2) a will of Rahimanbi conferring the Office on him. The history of the case shows that appellant never enjoyed the office in his own right by any undisputed title for 30 years, as he claims. He only acted for his mother-in-law, at times at most, whenever Abdul Khader did not assert his right. As regards the will, it is clear, she could not give away the office which she herself never possessed, much less to a son-in-law outside the family, when her husband's cousin claimed and managed the properties. The appellant argued that the office ~~xxx~~ descended to women only, but this is entirely unsupported by any evidence. Even if it is admitted, he is not a woman to profit by the allegation.

6. In conclusion, I hold respondent entitled to the Office and dismiss the appeal. It seems to me the appellant got the office by virtue of the exparte order of Government dated 28th November 1907, which it is high time I vacated in favour of the rightful claimant, the respondent.

SD/- M.A. Narayana Iyengar,

Deputy Commissioner,
Bangalore District.

3-7-1919
Bangalore.

'COPY'

Deputy Commissioner,
Bangalore District.

D.V.R.





25-1-1922

09.

Before the Government of H. H.
3273
the Maharaja of Mysore, at Bangalore.

Mysore Stamp Act 1913
Court Fee Rs. 1-0-0

Murzrai appeal no 10 of 19-20.

Appellant-	Respondent-
Syed Shea Ali,	Syed Dark, son of
Murzavan of the	Abdul Khader,
Raja Hussein Dargah	residing in old
at Balepet, Bangalore	Police Line, Civil
city	and Military P
	Bangalore.

Under Section 21 of the Mysore Murzarai Regulation, the appellant above named begs to appeal against the order dated the 3rd July 1919 of the Deputy Commissioner, Bangalore District in Murzarai appeal no 3 of 18-19 setting aside the respondent's

entitled to the office of Mirasdar in question and that the appellant should vacate the office in his favour on the following, amongst other, grounds:—

I That the order of the learned Deputy Commissioner is against law and the facts of the case

II That the learned Deputy Commissioner erred in holding that one Abdul Khadar, the father of the respondent was a joint Inamdar along with Rahimansab, the maternal uncle of the appellant, inasmuch as there is not an iota of evidence on record to show that he, the said Abdul Khadar had the right by heritage through his father or ever managed the affairs of the Darga in question and inasmuch as the decision of the civil court in the year 1896 referred to in the order under appeal related to the recovery of rent only and did not deal with the question of the Mujavarship as the determination of this question was entirely outside the jurisdiction of the civil courts.

3 That the learned Deputy Commissioner erred in holding that Rahimanbi (the mother-in-law of the appellant) who managed the affairs of the Dargah in question for a number of years even after the death of her husband to the utter exclusion of the respondents' father had no power under the law to nominate her successor to the office by means of a will. Inasmuch as there is ample evidence led in to show that the Mujavarship descended to females only from the time of the grant and that Rahimanbi held the office and discharged the duties pertaining thereto till her death, the appellant respectfully submits that she was fully entitled under the law to appoint her successor and that the appellant's title to the office is good in law.

4 That it is clear from the records that the appellant has been managing the affairs of the Dargah as Mujavar for over 30 years most satisfactorily and to oust him from the office now is really very unfair and inequitable especially when the 1st respondent even if any,

are clearly barred by time

- Wherefore the appellant respectfully prays that this Hon'ble court may be graciously pleased to send for the records, hear the parties and set aside the order of the Deputy Commissioner. The appellant further prays that pending disposal of the appeal a Stay order may kindly issue directing the Deputy Commissioner to keep his order in abeyance, as otherwise it will be given effect to and the appellant will be immediately ousted from the piece of which he has been in possession for years and which has been recognised by the Government in their order No 252 dated 28th Nov 1907 (Annx 2-75-84) (illegible)

A certified copy of the order of the Deputy Commissioner is herewith produced.

22.7.09
Bangalore

Yours





Before the Government of H. H. the Maharaja of Mysore at Bangalore

~~In the Court of~~

Muzrai appeal Case No of 1917-18

Appellant
Syed Ibha Ali

Vs.

Respondent
Syed Isak.

I the appellant above named do hereby nominate and appoint Mr D Shama Rao BA LL Advocate, in the above suit and do hereby empower the said Advocate to appear from and on my behalf in the above suit, to take all and any steps which may be necessary on my behalf arising out of or in connection with the above suit either during progress or after its decision, to sign and subscribe his name to any document which he may deem proper, to execute any decree that may be passed in favour and to receive out of the said Court any sum of money which may be lodged or become payable or receivable on my behalf and on receipt thereof to grant receipt or other sufficient discharges for the same, to withdraw, compromise or refer to arbitration the said suit, to appoint one or more substitute or substitutes and to act and perform all other matters and things relating to or connceted therewith, to represent me in matters relating to the same and to act in the premises as fully and effectually to all intents and purposes as I might do if personally present and did the same. And I do hereby agree to pay all fees, costs, charges and expenses which may be incurred and to allow, ratify, and confirm all and singulalr whatsoever the said Advocate shall lawfully do or cause or procure to be done in the premises by the virtue of these presents

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand this 2nd day of July 1919.

ACCEPTED

D Shama Rao
Advocate for appellant

Signed before me by the executant who I *known to me.*

D S R

Ing Works, Bangalore City.

ಶೀರ್ಷಿಕೆ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ ಮತ್ತು ಪ್ರಕರಣದ

a tenant of the Durga properties for rent in the Munsiff's Court, her suit was dismissed on the ground that her title to the management was not established and Syed Abdul Khader who defended the suit as 2nd defendant admitted having collected the rent as the Munsarar.

4. In 1906, Sythabi, daughter of Rahiman Bi and husband of appellant applied to the Deputy Commissioner to oust the respondent from the office. Her application was rejected, one of the grounds of rejection being her reliance on an alleged Sanad of Tippu Sultan of 1804 which could not possibly be genuine.

5. Both Rahiman Bi and Sythabi are now dead and appellant claims

the office by (1) an alleged long enjoy-
-ment for over 30 years and (2) a will
of Rahiman Bi conferring the office
on him. The history of the case shows
that appellant never enjoyed the office
in his own ~~office~~ right by any un-
disputed title for 30 years as he claims.
He only acted for his mother-in-law
at times at most, whenever Abdul-
khader did not assert his right. As
regards the will, it is clear, she could
not give away the office which she
herself never possessed, much less to
a son-in-law outside the family,
when her husband's cousin claimed
and managed the properties. The
appellant ~~argued~~ argued that the office —
descended to women only, this is entirely
unsupported by any evidence. Even if
it is admitted, he is not a woman
to profit by the allegation.

6. In conclusion, I hold: respondent

entitled to the office and dismiss the appeal. It seems to me the appellant got the office by virtue of the exparte order of Government dated 28th November 1907, which it is high time be vacated in favour of the rightful claimant, the respondent.

Sd/ Dr. A. Narayan Iyengar
Deputy Commissioner
Bangalore Dt

Dt 3-7-19
Bangalore

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER'S BANGALORE DISTRICT. OFFICE

"Copy"
[illegible]

For Deputy Commissioner
Bangalore Dt

Copy applied on 4-7-19
Copy ready on 5-7-19
Copy delivered on 5-7-19

Number of words — 420
Copying fee — 0-10-0
Comparing fee — 0-2-6
Total 0-12-6

G. R /S. VI—G/32]

SUBJECT.....

.....

.....

2165

Diary No. of letter replied to..... .....

Section Inspection

File No. 32-13

Serial No. 7

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT

( )

, the *191*

No. 1489 Encl

Date of issue 13 : 11 : 19

Signed by Mr. A. Muthuswamy Ayyadgar

To

The Dy. Commr,

Bangalore Dist,

Sir,

Adverting to your letter no. 228 dt 10th July 1919 reporting on the Inamdarship of Raja Hussain Darga at Balepet, Bangalore, I am directed to forward herewith appeal petition

Encl.

Regd. no. 202 (a) from
Syed Sha Ali, Muzavar
of the Darga, and to request
that the entire Govt.
records bearing on the
subject may be sent
up for reference
together with a detailed
report dealing with
the grounds urged in
the appeal petition.

I have etc.

List of enclosures.

DD

for Secretary
to
Muz-Dept.
27/10/43

Copied by

Examined by.

WD 1744—GPB 30,000—19 3 19

G.R.S. 27]

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(*Continuation sheet draft form.*)

1490

Proc. 32-13-J

Dt. 13th Nov. 13

Office of the Deputy Commissioner,
Bangalore District,
Dated Bangalore, the 10th June 1920.

Ste 459 Lewis Thorpe
19-6

DIARY No. 2607

From

Thomas Lee Gwatkin, Esq., B.A., F.I.C.S.,
Deputy Commissioner,
Bangalore District.

339 5

To

The Hon'ble T. P. Jayaram, Esq., B.A., F.C.S., D.L.,
Secretary to the Government of Mysore,
Revenue Department,
Bangalore.

Sir,

With reference to your letter No. [illegible] dated 4th November 1919, forwarding the petition of Syed [illegible] against my order in the matter of the Improvement of [illegible] at Balepet in the Bangalore City and calling for the entire proceedings bearing on the subject together with a report on the merits of the case, I have the honor to submit herewith the file of proceedings with the Bangalore Amildar's report No. 686 dated 16th March 1920.

The facts of the case have been fully set forth in my order dated 3rd July 1919 and the same is on the enclosed file.

The appeal petition and its enclosures are returned herewith.

Petition received in this office from Syed [illegible] praying for the same office is also submitted, since the appeal has been transferred,

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

T. L. Gwatkin
Deputy Commissioner,
Bangalore District.

T.E.V.P.

From

To

Dated

Despatched

Received

General No.

No.

Enclosure No.

G. R. S. VI—G/32]

SUBJECT.....

.....

.....

Diary No. of letter replied to 4001

Section
File No. 32
Serial No. 513

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT,
( )
the 191

No.

Date of issue.....

Signed by.....

To

The Deputy Commissioner
Bangalore &t=

Sir,

Adverting to your letter no 4598 dt 16-6-20, reporting on the appeal petition of Syed Shah Ali claiming the Muzzavarship of the Raja Hussaini Dargah at Balepet, Bangalore city, I am ~~dir~~ directed to invite ~~your~~ reference to the petition presented to you on the 24th Sept 1919 by one

P-T over.

Syed Kutbuddin, claiming the
office in question as the son of
the late holder's daughter and
to request that you ~~xx~~ will
be so good as to ~~Conduct for~~ inquire
~~her investigation~~ into the peti-
tioner's claims and resubmit
the records with your ~~opinion~~ finding
thereon at a very early date

The records are returned
for reference and resubmission

I have Etc
~~xxxxxxx~~ secretary
Rc. 12
Rly Muzrai dept
17/7/20

17/7/20

Read
21.7.20

List of enclosure

Copied by

Examined by

WD 86—GPB—60,000—15 11 16

2067

1920 21

Heer

32-18

11

6850

19

From

The Deputy Commissioner
Bangalore Dt

To

The Inungra Secretary
to the Govt. of Mysore
Bangalore

Dated
Despatched 5th April

Received

General No. Ho 45 APR 1921
No. 1920

Enclosure No. One file sent separately

Subject

Re: the Inungavarshik
of Raja Hussain Dargah
at Balepet Bangalore City

Office of the Asst Commissioner,
Bangalore District,
Bangalore, 4th April 1921.

No. HC 459 Revel 19-20 Ouestfile Dasti separately in a packet

From

M.A.Narayana Iyengar, B.A., B.L., F.M.U.,
Deputy Commissioner,
Bangalore District.

To

T.T.Jayarama Iyer, I.S.O., B.A., B.L.,
Secretary to the Government of Madras
Land Thanding Officer, Revenue Department.

Sir,

With reference to your letter No.301/Muz.2-13-19 dated 27th July 1920, forwarding for report the petition of Syed Mutbudeen, claiming the office of the Muzavarship of the said Dargah at Talpet in Bangalore City, I have the honor to state that out of the three claimants, Syed Isak claimed the office as being the only surviving male member of the family. Syed Sha Ali claimed through his wife who was the daughter of the last office holder Syed Khasim and lastly the appellant Mutbudeen claimed through his mother who was the oldest daughter of the said Syed Khasim.

2. Syed Sha Ali who claims the office as the son-in-law of the last office holder, Syed Khasim has no right to it as according to his own admission the appellant Mutbudeen is the son of Roboobi who was the elder of the two daughters of the said Syed Khasim and (Syed Sha Ali) had married the younger who died without any issues.

3. The other two claimants filed two different geneological trees upon which their respective advocates chiefly relied. The case was therefore referred to the Amildar of Bangalore Taluk for enquiry and report as to the genuineness of the two geneological trees.

4. The Amildar who held an enquiry reports that the appellant Mutbudeen examined three witnesses who all corroborate his version as to the genuineness of the geneological tree produced by him; whereas the respondent Syed Isak did not examine any witnesses to prove his allegations. There is no reason to disbelieve the version of the witnesses examined

examined by the Accountant. Thus the genealogical tree produced C1
by the appellant Kutbudeen should be considered as genuine, as the respondent has not produced any evidence to disprove it.

5. According to this evidence, the respondent Syed Isak's father was only a cousin brother of the last office holder, Syed Khasim and not his uterine brother.

6. Under these circumstances, I am of opinion that out of the three claimants Syed Isak, Syed Shaik Ali and Syed Kutbudeen, the last one Syed Kutbudeen is the nearest heir to the last office holder Syed Khasim.

7. The entire Vernacular records are herewith submitted.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant.

M K Narasimhachar

12

G. R. S. VI—G/32]

SUBJECT.....

.....

.....

Diary No. of letter replied to 2667

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

, the *191* .

Date of issue 18.7.21

Signed by Jnr Dy. Nizar

Section

File No. 32

Serial No 12 913

No. 755

To

The Dy. Commr.,

Bangalore Dist.

Sir,

Adverting to Correspondence ending with your letter no. H.C. 459 dt 5th April 1921 reporting on the mutawarship of Raja Hussein Darga at Balepet, Bangalore city, I am directed to request that you will be so good as to report how the case

over.

doing duties during the last
25 years and in what rights.
Orders of appointments
may also be forwarded for
ref.

(2) The records are herewith
returned for ref. & return

I have etc
U/C 14/7/21
Hon Secretary

RA
14.7.21

List of enclosures.

Copied by

Examined by

2296

Office of the Deputy Commissioner,
Bangalore District,
Dated Bangalore, 23rd July 1921.

No. Nc. 459 g 19-20
the one hundred.

From

M.A.Narayana Iyengar, Esq., B.A., B.L.,
Deputy Commissioner,
Bangalore District.

GEN & REV. SECT
25 JUL 1921

DIARY No. 226
1921 22
SECTION Heer
FILE No. 32-13
ITEM No. 13

To

T.E.Jayarama Iyer, Esq., B.A., B.L.,
Secretary to the Government of His Highness
the Maharaja of Mysore, Muzrai Department.

Sir,

With reference to your letter No.288/Muz.32-13-12 dated 18th instant, re the Muzavarship of Raja Hussain Durga at Balepet in the Bangalore City, I have the honor to state that from the report of the Amildar and the statements of witnesses recorded by him in this behalf, it is ascertained that during the life time of Rahiman Bi, her son-in-law Syed Sha Ali whom she was maintaining was looking after the duties of the Muzavar on her behalf. Even after her death in the year 1903, he continued to be in the office. Licenses issued for conducting the 'Uras' are in his name. No order of -- appointment was produced by any of the three claimants.

The entire Vernacular records are herewith resubmitted.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant.

M.A. Narayana Iyengar
Deputy Commissioner,
Bangalore District.

From

To

Dated

Despatched

Received

General No.

No.

Enclosure No.

G. R. S. VI—G/32]

SUBJECT.....

.....

.....

Diary No. of letter replied to 226

Section

File No. 3[illegible]

Serial No 165 SC 14

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

, the 191 .

No.

To)

The Dy. Comm'r,

Bangalore Dist

Date of issue 13-[illegible]

Signed by Mr. T.E.J.

Sir,

Adverting to [illegible] Correspdce.

ending with your letter No.

H.C. 459 Dt 25th July 19.

regarding the Muzaramin

of Raja Hussein Dange

at Balepet, Bangalore

I am directed to repeat

to be informed [illegible]

Syed Kuthubdeen [illegible]

how dd

over.

[illegible]

reported to be the nearest heir to the last office-holder Syed Khasim is fit and competent to be appointed to the said post.

Where he is what he is now doing & whether he

(2) No evels. are herewith returned for ref. & re-Sales.

I have etc.

Sd/ Secretary.

13/8/24

12/8/24

List of enclosures.

Copied by

Examined by

1053

Office of the Deputy Commissioner,

Bangalore District,

No. Jc. 459 / 1 Bundle of records 19-20

Dated Bangalore, 17th September '21.

From

M.A.Narayana Iyengar, Esq., B.A., B.L.,

Deputy Commissioner,

Bangalore District.

CPH & REV. SEC. 20 SEP 1921

79 REV 1102

21-1922

DISTRICT 9mu2

Rev. 32-13

15

To

T.E.Jayarama Iyer, Esq., B.A., B.L.,

Secretary to the Government of His Highness

the Maharaja of Mysore, Muzrai Department.

Sir,

With reference to your letter No.712/Muz.32-13-11 dated 13th August 1921 re the Muzavarship of Raja Hussain Derga at Balepet in the Bangalore City, I have the honor to state that the Amildar reports that Syed Kutbudeen referred to in your letter is 24 years old and resides in a rented building at Malleswaram in the Bangalore City messing in his relative's house. He is said to be now without any work and fit and competent for the Muzavar Post.

The entire Vernacular records are herewith resubmitted.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant.

M A Narayana Iyengar

Deputy Commissioner,

Bangalore District.

AV 20/9/21

From

To

Dated

Despatched

Received

General No.

No.

Enclosure No

Proceedings of the Govt. of H.H.

the Maharaja of Mysore.

- - - - - - - -

R e a d:--

Petition dated 22nd July 1918 presented by Syed Isa Ali of Bangalore appealing against the Deputy Commissioner's order holding that Syed Esak, the respondent, is entitled to the office of the Muzavar of Raja Hussein Darga at Balepet, Bangalore City.

2. Petition dated 24th September 1918 of Syed Muthudin, grand-son of Syed Ahasim, the last male-holder, advancing his claim to the Muzavar's post in preference.

3. Correspondence ending with letter No. 459 dated 19th September 1921 from the -- Deputy Commissioner, Bangalore District, reporting on the subject.

- - - - - -

Order No. 1993 Miscellaneous - Jmz. 32-13-16 ek

Dated, Bangalore, 19th September 1921.

29.9

This appeal relates to the office of Muzavar of the Raja Hussein Darga at Balepet Bangalore City.

The following genealogical tree shows the relationship between the rival claimants to the office :--

---

Syed Ahasim (1)
(Deceased)

Rahiman Bi (deceased) (2).

(3) Cousin
Syed Abdul Khader

Syed Esak (6)

Rahboob Bi (4)

Syed Muthudin. (5)

Syed Bi (deceased) (5)

Syed Isa Ali (7) No issue.

The last male holder of the office was Syed Khasim (1) who died about 25 years ago. After his death, his son-in-law Syed Sahamali (7) was looking after the duties on behalf of Rahiman Bi (2) his widowed mother-in-law. She died in 1903 and Syed Sha Ali has continued to discharge the duties of the office since, though he has not been appointed to it permanently.

The question of filling up the place permanently having been taken up, Syed Isak (6) who is the son of a cousin of Syed Khasim (1) and Syed Sha Ali (7) claimed the office and the Deputy Commissioner decided on 3rd July 1911, in favour of the former on the ground that he was a male member of the family, while the latter's claim was based only on his marriage with the daughter of Syed Khasim (No. 1).

Kutbudin (8) who did not prefer any -- claim before the Deputy Commissioner has now preferred a petition to Government. The Deputy Commissioner, who was consulted as to his right, reports that he is even a nearer heir of the last male holder of the office, being his daughter's son, than Syed Isak, who is only a cousins' son and he virtually recommends the appointment of Syed Kutbudin, who is stated by him to be competent to discharge the duties of the post.

The fact that Syed Sha Ali has been -- discharging the duties of the office, for several years past does not confer any right on him, as his possession cannot be held to be adverse to the family of the hakdars.

Yes

Government therefore direct that Syed

Syed Muthucain be appointed as Mozavar of the Hussein Darga. Referred to above.

28/9/21

Secretary to Government,
Revenue Department.

Rev
2.10.21

27/9/21

The Deputy Commissioner, Bangalore District
returning the records.

- - - - - -

May this Order be Printed?

27/9/21

Proceedings of the Government of His Highness

the Maharaja of Mysore

R e a d:--

Petition dated 22nd July 1919, presented by Syed Sha Ali of Bangalore, appealing against the Deputy Commissioner's order holding that Syed Esak, the respondent, is entitled to the office of Muzavar of the Raja Hussain Darga at Balepet, Bangalore City.

2. Petition dated 24th September 1919, of Syed Kuthudin, grandson of Syed Khasim, the last male-holder, advancing his claim to the Muzavar's post in question.

3. Correspondence ending with letter No. 459 dated 19th September 1921, from the Deputy Commissioner, Bangalore District, reporting on the subject.

O r d e r No. 1973
Muz: 32-13-14

Dated, Bangalore, the -- October 1921.

This appeal relates to the office of Muzavar of the Raja Hussain Darga at Balepet, Bangalore City.

2. The following genealogical tree shows the relationship between the rival claimants to the office:--



3. The last male holder of the office was Syed Khasim (1) who died about 25 years ago. After his death, his son-in-law Syed Sha Ali (7) was looking after the duties on behalf of Rahiman Bi (2), his widowed mother-in-law. She died in 1903, and Syed Sha Ali has continued to discharge the duties of the office since, though he has

has not been appointed to it permanently.

4. The question of filling up the place permanently having been taken up, Syed Esak (6) who is the son of a cousin of Syed Khasim (1) and Syed Sha Alli (7) claimed the office and the Deputy Commissioner decided on 3rd July 1919, in favour of the former on the ground that he was a male member of the family, while the latter's claim was based was based only on his marriage with the daughter of Syed Khasim (No. 1).

5. Kutbudin (8) who did not prefer any claim before the Deputy Commissioner has now presented a petition to Government. The Deputy Commissioner, who was consulted as to his right, reports that he is even a nearer heir of the last male holder of the office, being his daughter's son, than Syed Esak, who is only a cousin's son and -- recommends the appointment of Syed Kutbudin, who is stated by him to be competent to discharge the duties of the post.

6. The fact that Syed Sha Alli has been discharging the duties of the office, for several years past does not confer any right on him, as his possession cannot be held to be adverse to the family of the hakdars.

7. Government, therefore, direct that Syed Kutbudin be appointed as Muzavar of the Raja Hussain Darga referred to above.

M/s. V. E. Jayanamma Aiyar

Secretary to Government,

Muzrai Department.

To

The Deputy Commissioner, Bangalore District,

returning the records.

D.N.

"Press Copy"

Secretary to Govt.,
Muzrai Dept.

...OVAL
181
8. 12. 21

Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore.

~~GENERAL AND REVENUE DEPARTMENT.~~
Muzrai Department

G. O. No. 1973—Muz. 32-13-16, dated 20th October 1921.

Raja Hussain Darga, Balepet, Bangalore City
Passed order as the post of Muzavar

READ—

Petition dated 22 July 1919, presented by Syed Sha Ali of Bangalore, appealing against the Deputy Commissioner's order holding that Syed Esak, the respondent, is entitled to the office of Muzavar of the Raja Hussain Darga at Balepet, Bangalore City.

2. Petition dated 24th September 1919, of Syed Kutbudin, grand-son of syed Khasim, the last male-holder, advancing his claim to the Muzavar's post in question.

3. Correspondence ending with letter No. 459, dated 19th September 1921, from the Deputy Commissioner, Bangalore District, reporting on the subject.

ORDER NO. 1973—MUZ. 32-13-16, DATED 20TH OCTOBER 1921.

This appeal relates to the office of Muzavar of the Raja Hussain Darga at Balepet, Bangalore City.

2. The following genealogical tree shows the relationship between the rival claimants to the office:—

(1) Syed Khasim (deceased) — (2) —Rahiman Bi (deceased)

(3) Cousin Syed Abdul Khadir — (6) Syed Esak

(4) Rahoob Bi — (8) Syed Kutbudin

(5) Syed Bi (deceased) — (7) Syed Sha Ali (No issue)

3. The last male-holder of the office was Syed Khasim (1) who died about 25 years ago. After his death, his son-in-law, Syed Sha Ali (7) was looking after the duties on behalf of Rahiman Bi (2), his widowed mother-in law. She died in 1903 and Syed Sha Ali has continued to discharge the duties of the office since, though he has not been appointed to it permanently.

4. The question of filling up the place permanently having been taken up, Syed Esak (6) who is the son of a cousin of Syed Khasim (1) and Syed Sha Ali (7) claimed the office and the Deputy Commissioner decided on 3rd July 1919, in favour of the former on the ground that he was a male member of the family, while the latter's claim was based only on his marriage with the daughter of Syed Khasim (1.)

5. Kutbudin (8) who did not prefer any claim before the Deputy Commissioner has now presented a petition to Government. The Deputy Commissioner. who was consulted as to his right, reports that he is even a nearer heir of the last male-holder of the office, being his daughter's son, than Syed Esak, who is only a cousin's son and

ORDER No. 1973—MUZ. 32-13-16, DATED 20TH OCTOBER 1621.

recommends the appointment of Syed Kutbudin, who is stated by him to be competent to discharge the duties of the post.

6. The fact that Syed Sha Ahtli has been discharging the duties of the office for several years past does not confer any right on him, as his possession cannot be held to adverse to the family of the hakdars.

7. Government, therefore, direct that Syed Kutbudin be appointed as Muzavar of the Raja Hussain Darga referred to above.

T. E. JAYARAMA AIYAR,
Secy. to Gout., Mu/Dept.

To—The Deputy Commissioner, Bangalore District, returning the records.

Ekd.—C. R.

W D 1114—GPB—28-11-21—200

ಪತ್ರಿಕಾ ರಂಜನಿ. ಮೈಸೂರು

ದಿನಾಂಕ 7-4-31

ಸಂಪಾದಕರಿಗೆ:

ಮಾನ್ಯರೇ, ದಯವಿಟ್ಟು ಕೆಳಗಿನ ಪತ್ರವನ್ನು ತಮ್ಮ ಪತ್ರಿಕೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರಕಟಿಸಿ ಉಪಕರಿಸಬೇಕಾಗಿ ಪ್ರಾರ್ಥನೆ.

ಇತಿ ತಮ್ಮ ವಿಧೇಯ
ಬಿ. ಎಸ್. ಚಿದಂಬರಪ್ಪ

ಸಮಸ್ಯೆಗಳು

ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳ ಮತ್ತು ಜನಸಾಮಾನ್ಯರ ನಡುವಿನ ಅಂತರ

ಈಗ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಮುಖ್ಯವಾಗಿದ್ದ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆಯೊಂದನ್ನು ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾಪಿಸಿ ಅದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಕೆಲವು ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಗಳನ್ನು ಬರೆಯಲು ಇಚ್ಛಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಈ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆಯು ಈಗ ಅಷ್ಟು ಮುಖ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಕಾಣದಿದ್ದರೂ ಇದರ ಮೂಲಕ ಕೆಲವು ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ ತತ್ವಗಳನ್ನು ಹೊರಗೆಡಹಲು ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಇದನ್ನು ಆರಿಸಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಈ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆಯು ಮೈಸೂರು ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾತ್ರ ಇರುವಂಥದಲ್ಲ. ಬೇರೆ ಎಲ್ಲ ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನಗಳಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಇದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಮೈಸೂರಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಇದು ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗಿಯೇ ಇದೆ. ಈ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆಯು ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳಿಗೂ ಜನಸಾಮಾನ್ಯರಿಗೂ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟಿದ್ದು. ಇದನ್ನು ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾಪಿಸಿ ಅದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ನಮ್ಮನ್ನು ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾಗಿ ಕೋರಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಹೀಗೆ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆಯು ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಎಷ್ಟು ಕೆಲಸಮಾಡುತ್ತದೆಯೋ ಅಷ್ಟು ಮಾತ್ರ ನಾನೂ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಹೀಗೆ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಬಂದಾಗ ಅದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ನಮ್ಮನ್ನು ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾಗಿ ಕೋರಿದ್ದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆಯು ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಎಷ್ಟು ಕೆಲಸಮಾಡುತ್ತದೆಯೋ ಅಷ್ಟು ಮಾತ್ರ ನಾನೂ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಹೀಗೆ ಸಂಪಾದಕರಿಗೆ ಒಂದು ಪತ್ರವನ್ನು ಬರೆಯುವುದೇ ಕಷ್ಟವಾಗಿದ್ದ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆಯಲ್ಲವೆ?

ಇಂಥ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆಗಳನ್ನು



Received
Exh

21 22

Mur

Received
Rs. 1/- on

14-11-1921

14/11/21

Subd

The copy of final order in this
case has been filed in
file. A copy may be granted
if applied for.

14.11.21

14.11.21

14/11/21

Received copy of the enclosure
of memo of 11 c. this date.

[illegible]
15. 11. 2[illegible]